

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT  
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Final Meeting Summary: Session # 14  
Thursday, September 25, 2003  
Washington State University Tri-Cities  
Consolidated Information Center, Rooms 120 & 120A  
Richland, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met on Thursday, September 25, 2003 from 12:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Washington State University Tri-Cities Consolidated Information Center in Richland, Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was:

1. To hear a response from the Service to the Committee advice on the White Bluffs sloughing issue and the Committee advice on draft management alternatives; and
2. To hear a presentation on the draft objectives to date.

**Welcome and Introductions**

Greg Hughes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) Designated Federal Official (DFO) and Project Leader, Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members, the public and other attendees. He briefed the Committee on the status of the re-charter process. The re-charter package is in the Washington D.C. and the Secretary of the Interior's office is in the final stages of finalizing the appointments. Mr. Hughes read a statement from the Secretary of the Interior's office saying they anticipate sending appointment letters out soon.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, reviewed the day's agenda, noting that the purpose of the day's session was more informational and organizational. The Committee will hear the Service response to the Committee's advice on preliminary management alternatives and the White Bluffs sloughing issue. The Planning Team will also report on where they are in the process, and present draft objectives to date. The Committee will discuss organizing subcommittees.

Jim Watts, Committee Chair, reviewed the public comment process and reminded those making public comment that there was a five-minute time limit. He stated that the public comment period was scheduled to immediately follow the opening of the meeting and Committee business. A public comment sheet was available at the sign in table for those interested in giving comment. He also reviewed the Committee's purpose and charter.

**Meeting Minutes from Session #13**

Mr. Watts asked the Committee for any changes to the summary from Session #13 as drafted. There were no suggestions. The Committee approved a motion to adopt the meeting summary as drafted.

<b>Action:</b> Committee members adopted the meeting summary from Session #13 as drafted.
---

## **Service Response to Committee Advice on White Bluffs and Draft Management Alternatives**

Greg Hughes directed the Committee members' attention to the Service response letter to the Committee advice on preliminary management alternatives and the White Bluffs sloughing issue. Mr. Hughes reminded the Committee members that they also received a White Bluffs sloughing issue update memo from the Chairman and Ad-Hoc subcommittee chair via email detailing a \$6.35 million U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) proposal to study the White Bluffs sloughing, including recommendations on action.

Jim Watts added that the issue has been around for some time, and it is a compliment to the Committee's work that this has been brought to the attention of the Department of the Interior. Committee members questioned what priority this proposal had been given. Mr. Watts explained that the information he has heard from Senator Murray's office was that this issue had been given priority consideration in the Appropriations Committee. He suggested that there have been a lot of studies that tried to understand what is going on with the issue, but few that have tried to examine what can be done to ameliorate the landslides.

Mr. Hughes assured the Committee members that this issue will not disappear, and that several people in Washington D.C. understand the nature of the problem and are working to understand the issue of the landslides. Rex Baum, who wrote the proposal from USGS, is considered an expert in major landslides in this region. Mr. Hughes noted that characterizing the slides is the foremost issue, then identifying action alternatives. Several Committee members noted the importance of getting the project underway as soon as possible.

With respect to the draft management alternatives, Mr. Hughes said that the Service took the Committee's advice verbatim. The Service cut the alternatives down to four alternatives from five. Also, the Service concurred with the Committee that the "one size fits all" approach to resource management will not work on the Monument.

## **Planning Team Update on Planning Progress and Schedule**

Mike Marxen from the Service's Region 1 Planning Office presented an update on the planning process to the Committee. He started by saying that, given the complexity of the project, the Team has made great progress. The process is on schedule as originally planned, and the Team continues to move through the final steps before releasing a Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (CCP/EIS) to the public in the fall of 2004.

The Team is currently completing the draft preliminary management alternatives, with the advice from the Committee, and moving into developing components of the draft Plan, also with the Committee's help. Step 5 in the Planning Timeline (Attachment A) represents two things: (1) writing the plan; and (2) releasing the plan. Mr. Marxen proceeded to cover several specific topics related to where the Planning Team is in the process.

## **GIS Mapping and Analysis**

The Team has been working to assemble, consolidate and analyze all the data they have collected to date. They have been trying to gather as much data as possible from a variety of sources over

the last couple of years. Now, they are working to consolidate that data and understand where the information gaps exist. One of the gaps they are currently working on is the additional vegetative cover on the North Slope, where current data is lacking. As data gaps are filled, they will overlay the data to begin to analyze the biological and public use situations on the Monument.

The biological analysis started with the resource reviews, includes existing plans from other sources (i.e. Department of Energy, The Nature Conservancy), and now, with the help of several scientists, the Team is working to collapse the mountain of information into something valuable and useful. The Service has been discussing a way to make the data available to the public, for example, through a File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site. (Ed. Note: much of this data was obtained under conditions that do not allow the Service to share the data without the permission of the original owner.) The Team consolidated the data into eight conservation targets for biodiversity, moving from large to small in focus, and will likely be included in the objectives:

1. Shrub-Steppe Matrix;
2. Seeps, Springs and Streams;
3. Riverine and Riparian;
4. Sand Dunes;
5. White Bluffs;
6. Regional Bird Species of Concern;
7. Ground Squirrels; and
8. Umtanum Buckwheat.

Another type of analysis is management alternatives and public use. Management has to be sensitive to what is in each area. For example, the tricky situation with assessing potential public use is the existence of cultural resources. While the Team recognizes the significance and importance of the cultural resources, they also recognize the importance of not revealing the existence of any particular sites. One option the Team is reviewing is classifying cultural resource areas hierarchically from highly sensitive (closure) to less sensitive (seasonal closure).

Mr. Marxen reported that the big question for the planners is to determine what recreational uses are appropriate for the landscape. He added that well over 60 possible activities were suggested from public scoping and Committee advice, among other sources. Policy guidance mandates that the Team assess each one of the uses for appropriateness and then conduct compatibility determinations. Subcommittees will help the Team with this exercise. In the end, whatever is allowed on the landscape has to be compatible with the Monument resources and the Presidential Proclamation.

At this point, Committee members asked questions regarding the weighting criteria used to sift through the potential uses to determine what is appropriate on the Monument. Mr. Marxen clarified that the steps the Planning Team is taking to go through appropriate use and compatibility determination review are guided by national policy. Furthermore, Mr. Marxen reminded the Committee of the six priority uses identified in the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act: Hunting, Fishing, Wildlife Observation, Wildlife Photography, Interpretation, and Environmental Education.

The Planning Team is looking for help from subcommittees to address those uses that are not compatible with either the Monument resources or the Presidential Proclamation.

#### Cooperating Agency Meetings

Mr. Marxen reported that this topic is connected with writing the EIS. The Council on Environmental Quality, which has oversight over the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and reports directly to the President, require the Service, and all other federal agencies engaging in NEPA activities to invite other agencies to help write the environmental documents and analyze the data. The Team now has a total of 12 Cooperating Agencies, representing local, regional, tribal and federal government. The 12 Cooperating Agencies are: City of Richland, three Counties (Adams, Benton, Grant), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Ecology, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Bonneville Power Administration, US Bureau of Reclamation, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Department of Energy, and the Yakama Indian Nation. (Ed Note: the Yakama Indian Nation is a Cooperating Tribal Government.)

#### Coordination with the Tribes

On July 28, 2003, the Service led a field trip on the Monument that included representative of the three Treaty Tribes (Nez Perce, Yakama Indian Nation, CTUIR) and the Wanapum Band. Mr. Marxen reported that this was a very successful trip, and educational for everyone that attended. Greg Hughes added that it was beneficial for the Service to hear the different Tribal Nation perspectives of the land. The Planning Team received a lot of input on some very specific issues they are dealing with in the CCP/EIS.

Mr. Marxen also reported that the Service made a presentation to the Yakama Indian Nation Tribal Council on September 9, 2003. This was a direct result of the successful field trip, and was also very educational for everyone in attendance.

Meetings with the Tribal Nations are on going, and will occur many more times over the course of the planning process. The staff is currently working to set a meeting with the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation.

#### Public Involvement

The third Planning Workshop was completed in June, again with good participation throughout the three-day activity. The third workshop primarily focused on preliminary alternatives based on the Committee advice and preliminary management objectives. Mr. Marxen said that all three workshops were very helpful, and that there are no more workshops scheduled at this time. The focus of the Team now is to sit down and start writing sections of the Plan.

Planning Update #2 was mailed out in June to everyone on the Monument mailing list. The contents of the Update included a synopsis of the comments from public scoping, and a sampling of some of the issues being dealt with in the Plan. The third planning update is scheduled to go out in October and will cover the range of preliminary management alternatives, as advised by the Committee, and a sample of the preliminary objectives to date.

Another activity on which the Committee provided advice early in the process includes presentations to outside groups and constituents. The Service is continuing to reach out to community groups and other appropriate venues to help educate and engage a broad array of stakeholders.

### **Committee Business**

Jim Watts read a resignation letter from Ed Rykiel. Mr. Watts also suggested that he would like to draft a letter of recognition, thanking Mr. Rykiel for his work on the Committee and assemble a memento for those that have served on the Committee.

**Action:** The Committee approved a motion for the Chair to draft a letter of recognition and work with the Service to assemble a memento for those that have donated their time to serve on the Committee.

Mr. Watts also reviewed a letter of advice from the Committee, and the DOE response letter, on including B Reactor in the planning process. This topic was brought up in response to a request to send a letter to the Congressional delegation about the Atomic Heritage Foundation mission to preserve B Reactor. The Chair drafted a cover letter for the Congressional delegation that simply passes on the advice this Committee has already given regarding B Reactor, and the response letter from the DOE. The Federal Advisory Committee Act has strict guidelines against lobbying Congress for money. Mr. Watts wanted to stress that this Committee cannot legally send a letter lobbying Congress to fund a study.

Mr. Watts clarified that the recommendation in front of the Committee does not endorse what is being done about the B Reactor, but makes the Congressional delegation aware of what the Committee has officially submitted as advice to the Service and DOE.

Two Committee members opposed sending the cover letter and previous Committee advice to the local Congressional delegation.

**Action:** The Committee approved a motion to send a cover letter to the Congressional delegation forwarding the Committee's previous advice on B Reactor, and the DOE response.

### **Public Comment**

Armand Minthorn, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), addressed the Committee. He started by thanking the Committee for their time and the opportunity to provide them with information. He had a number of points he wanted to address before the Committee that he believes the CTUIR should be involved in through the government-to-government process.

### White Bluffs

Understanding that the Committee is charged with having a component to protect the Bluffs, he has concern that the Bluffs are being considered for a multi-agency, inter-jurisdictional

management approach. He referenced the Executive Summary of the USGS proposal stating they intend to study the “degree to which the landslides affect the salmon.” There has to be a responsibility for the treaty resources and as a Tribal member if there is any remedial action taken. In addition to the USGS proposal, there is a trust responsibility for the federal agencies to the Tribal Nations’ treaty rights.

As many on the Committee know, this is the last remaining spawning ground for salmon in the Reach. It is apparent to Mr. Minthorn that previous studies of the White Bluffs have led to more studies. He has concern that another five-year study may result in no action, and that the salmon spawning grounds may not have that much time. The Tribes have made clear to all the agencies that the White Bluffs are a sacred site. Salmon is critical to the cultural practices and beliefs of the Tribal Nations.

#### Cultural Resources

Mr. Minthorn is concerned about the difficulty the Planning Team is having in determining the significance of cultural resource sites. To the Tribal Nations, all cultural resources and cultural resource sites are sensitive. They cannot be categorized. Section 106 of the Native American Graves Repatriation Act does not categorize cultural resource sites. He asked that the Planning Team keep this in mind when considering cultural resources on the Monument and in the Plan.

#### Tribal Consultations

Mr. Minthorn informed the Committee that he is the Chairman of the Cultural Resources Committee for the CTUIR. He has been delegated to work with the Service on a government-to-government basis. He encourages the Service to contact him to set up government-to-government consultation meetings with him. The CTUIR need to be consulted often during the planning process. He added that his committee meets the first and third Tuesday of every month at their home. He offers up his committee as a forum for the government-to-government consultation process.

#### B Reactor

Mr. Minthorn expressed concern that the Committee has recommended including B Reactor in the planning process. The Service is mandated to protect natural resources and wildlife. B Reactor is not a natural site, and not wildlife. This Committee should consider that if B Reactor were to be managed, it would only take fiscal resources away from the natural resources on the Monument.

#### Locke Island

The continuing erosion of Locke Island is a major problem. The Island is a known cultural resource site, but it is also a burial ground for Mr. Minthorn’s ancestors. He is aware that the Committee is charged with providing advice to the Service and DOE. There must be a mechanism to protect the Island. The Committee must convey immediate action to the DOE.

#### Fish Management Plan

The Tribes must be consulted on any management dealing with the fish. If there is going to be any management of any resources, it must be comprehensive, and include the fish. This is a primary concern of all the Tribal Nations in the Reach because of the salmon and what that

means to them religiously and culturally. He again offers the services of his committee at the CTUIR for consultation on this issue.

### **Presentation of Draft Objectives To Date and the Need for Subcommittees**

Dan Haas, Lead Planner, addressed the Committee regarding draft management objectives. He highlighted how the Planning Team arrived at where they are to date. He presented an overview of how the Committee's advice had been used throughout the process, and how those steps built up to the point to where they currently are in the planning process, as described earlier by Mike Marxen.

He asked the Committee to refer to the draft objectives table in their packet (Attachment B). He also reminded the Committee that everything is draft to this point, and will remain that way until the draft plan is released for public review. He presented an example objective to the Committee, highlighting the goals, alternatives, and then the objectives. The alternatives are vague now, until the objectives are developed. One of the issues they have faced in writing the objectives for the Monument is that everyone is deeply involved in the various issues and activities, making it difficult to write reasonable objectives for all those issues.

Mr. Haas used as an example for the Committee the first goal, highlighting the fifth objective to address invasive species. Additionally, under the seventh goal the camping objective does not allow for it under current management (No Action alternative). Under each alternative, management allows camping to varying degrees. He pointed out that the Committee would notice no objectives under goal #13 because the Planning Team felt that most of the issues covered under this goal could be covered under other goals. He asked the Committee to consider whether this should remain a goal.

From a planning perspective, the use of subcommittees is critical to providing the Planning Team with diverse, timely and representative input on the Plan. Subcommittees can also use the opportunity to reach out to their constituents in critical times while the Plan is drafted. This will help get a cross-section of input on various issues that will be helpful when the Service distributes the draft plan.

There was a question on goal #7 where it relates to elk hunting. One member noted that the Committee has never fully discussed elk hunting, nor have they provided advice on the topic. If it is a relevant issue that the Committee could reasonably expect to be controversial, it should necessarily come before the Committee first.

Mr. Haas responded by saying that the Planning Team wanted to present a starting point to the Committee. It is perfectly reasonable for subcommittees to review each of the alternatives and make recommendations for the Committee to consider as advice. This is the first time that this document has been presented, although the concepts of the objectives in the document have been developed from a variety of resources: public scoping, Committee advice, resource reviews, policies, consultations and public workshops, among other sources.

Greg Hughes added that this Committee has for a long time been eager to get to the details of the Plan. The Planning Team is now ready to get into the details, and while many of these issues will be difficult, they need to be aired and fully deliberated for consideration in the Plan.

The Committee members asked if they would be able to tap into the thinking behind developing some of these objectives. Mr. Haas responded by saying that introductory and background information will be included in the subcommittee discussions.

### **Committee discussion on subcommittee action plan for advice on objectives**

Alice Shorett led the Committee members through a discussion of the subcommittees. She explained what the purpose of the discussion on subcommittees was for the meeting, and the assignment the subcommittees would address until the next Committee meeting. She reminded the Committee of some important groundrules regarding the formation of subcommittees, and asked that they keep balance in mind when they make recommendations for additional at-large members. The five subcommittees are Public Use and Access, Natural Resources – Terrestrial, Natural Resources – Aquatic, Cultural and Historical Resources, and Valid Existing Rights.

Over the next couple of months, the subcommittees will be meeting with staff from the Planning Team to help them refine specific issues with respect to objectives. The subcommittees will provide feedback to the Planning on those issues when writing the draft Plan. The subcommittee will also work with the Planning Team to help them write specific objectives that will become part of the recommendations for the full Committee to consider as advice to the Service and DOE at the next meeting.

Ms. Shorett directed the Committee members to send any feedback on additional at-large members to Triangle Associates. Triangle will organize the logistics of the subcommittees and provide facilitation at the meetings. Committee members asked whether they would be looking at all of the alternative or only those related to the subcommittee focus. Dan Haas responded by saying that the Planning Team will divide the goals up to the appropriate subcommittee so that the meetings can stay focused. However, if a subcommittee wants to provide recommendations on a specific objective not in one of their assigned goals, the Service welcomes the input.

**Action:** Committee members will send additional recommendations for at-large subcommittee members to Triangle Associates. The Chair and DFO will appoint subcommittee members.

### **Report on Refuge Activities**

Greg Hughes reaffirmed that the Committee is beginning to embark on an intensely critical time in the planning process. He is encouraging Committee members to look at the aggregate of the issues, look at what is missing, what is good, and how to more fully develop the objectives. Faced with the current planning timeline and the scheduled deadline, there is no time to get into the finite details of every issue and wordsmith the objectives in subcommittee meetings. Mr. Hughes said the Committee has all the expert resources to be able to provide excellent advice on assembling a comprehensive list of objectives.



He continued by saying that the Service is analyzing a lot of data. The entrance signs are up. Ron Crouse has joined the team as the Outreach and Environmental Education Specialist. If there are other groups out there that the Service should address, Mr. Hughes encouraged Committee members to let him or Mr. Crouse know. There were a few fires over the summer, and the Service has secured restoration-funding dollars to address those. National fire policy is changing the requirement from three years to two years for implementing the restoration process. In a decreasing fiscal resource environment, a strong initial attack strategy is the best hope for addressing the long-term fire issue. The new Regional Director (Dave Allen) is on board, and there was a reception for him at the Monument that all Committee members were invited to in June. He is working hard in the region and in Washington D.C. engaging in all the issues that affect the Monument and the Service. The Nature Conservancy is continuing its monitoring of the ALE restoration. The success rate is still exceptional, and the Service hopes that will continue through the winter and into next spring.

### **Summary and Next Steps**

Alice Shorett summarized the meeting, highlighting the Service response on the White Bluffs and preliminary management alternatives advice, and a discussion on forming subcommittees. The Committee will provide suggestions to Triangle Associates for additional at-large members for subcommittees. She recapped Mr. Hughes' comments regarding the daily management activities, and added that action will likely be taken soon on appointing new Committee members.

She reminded the Committee of the next scheduled meeting:

- Thursday, December 4, 12:30 – 4:30PM, WSU-CIC, Rooms 120 & 120A

### **Public Comment**

Mary Hollen addressed the Committee regarding the USGS proposal to study the White Bluffs sloughing issue. Representative from the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) have previously stated that they are willing to make their data and earlier studies available in preparing any information or filling any data gaps relative to the CCP/EIS. To date, Ms. Hollen is not aware of any contact BPA has received for use of their data.

Greg Hughes thanked the Committee and public for attending, and adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Approved by:

---

Greg Hughes, DFO

---

Jim Watts, Chair

## MEETING ATTENDANCE

<b>Committee Seat</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Alternate</b>
K-12 Education	Karen Wieda	
Cities	Bob Thompson	<i>vacant</i>
Conservation/Environmental	Rick Leaumont	Mike Lilga
Counties		
Economic Development	Jim Watts	Harold Heacock
Outdoor Recreation	Rich Steele	
Public-at-Large	Kris Watkins	
Scientific/Academic		Eric Gerber
	David Geist	
	Gene Schreckhise	<i>vacant</i>
State		
Native American	Rex Buck	<i>vacant</i>
Utilities/Irrigation	Nancy Craig	<i>vacant</i>
Designated Federal Official	Greg Hughes	

### **Participants and Invited Speakers**

U.S. Department of Energy	Lloyd Piper
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Dan Haas
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Mike Marxen

### **Facilitators**

Triangle Associates, Inc.	Alice Shorett	Derek Van Marter
---------------------------	---------------	------------------

### **Meeting Support**

U.S. Department of Energy	Peggy Terlson
---------------------------	---------------

### **Observers**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Paula Call
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	David Smith
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Ron Crouse
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Jenna Gaston
U.S. Department of Energy	Tom Ferns
U.S. Department of Energy	Dana Ward
CTUIR	Armand Minthorn
CTUIR	Stuart Harris
Congressman Hastings Office	Joyce Olson
DOE Reading Room	Janice Parthree
BPA	Mary Hollen
PNNL	Jill Pospical
Benton County	Adam Fyall
City of Richland	Rita Mazur

Energy Northwest  
Jones and Stokes  
Backcountry Horsemen of WA  
Richland Rod and Gun Club

John Arbuckle  
Erin VanDehey  
Linda Smith  
Eugene Van Liew

## **DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS**

### **Committee's Packet of Materials**

Meeting Agenda (September 25, 2003)  
Draft Meeting Summary: Session #13 (May 29, 2003)  
Ed Rykiel Resignation Letter (July 1, 2003)  
US Fish and Wildlife Service Response Letter to Committee Advice on Preliminary  
Management Alternatives and White Bluffs Sloughing (July 29, 2003)  
USGS Proposal to Study White Bluffs Landslides  
Committee Update Memo from the Chair on the White Bluffs Issue (August 25, 2003)  
Planning Timeline  
Instructions and Potential Composition of Subcommittee Formation  
Subcommittee At-Large Member Contact Lists  
Draft Congressional Cover Letter from Committee on B Reactor (with B Reactor advice  
attached)  
Landslide Hazards Flyer  
Goal-by-Goal Comparisons Across Alternatives